

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,416	12/30/2003	Thomas B. Haverstock	TBH-00100	7845
28960	7590 10/23/200		EXAMINER	
	OCK & OWENS LI	P .	ALEXANDER, REGINALD	
	WOLFE ROAD LE, CA 94086		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
55141412	52, 011 7.000	•	1761	
			DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			L		
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/748,416	HAVERSTOCK, THOMAS B.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Reginald L. Alexander	1761		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Se	eptember 2006.			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>11-20</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	election requirement.			
	The specification is objected to by the Examine				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 lates ii ()	(PTO 412)		
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Card.

There is disclosed in Card a filtering device, comprising: a vessel 11 having an opening 13 at a proximal end and a closed distal end 12, wherein the interior of the vessel has a cross-section with a dimension and the dimension varies with longitudinal distance from the opening such that the vessel has a plurality of dimensions; a compressible filter assembly 15, comprising a compressible filter element 17 and a compressible support element 20 mounted over the compressible filter element and configured to maintain contact with the interior of the vessel for each of the plurality of dimensions; and a plunger element 16 configured for pushing the compressible filter assembly through the vessel.

In regards to the percentage of change in the pluralities of dimensions, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the vessel dimensions, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only

routine skill in the art. Arriving at applicant's claimed percentage of change would require modifying the size of the vessel and not the overall invention itself. Such a modification is not seen as patentably distinguishing over the prior art.

In regards to the use of the device for separating infusion material from an infused liquid, such is intended use only and provides no structural limitations to the claims. It is apparent that the device of Card could perform such a function. In regards to the vessel being a beverage cup, it is apparent that the vessel of Card could be used for beverages.

Claims 3-6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Card in view of Levinson.

Levinson discloses the use of a filter assembly wherein a paper filter is supported between two foam rings 14, 15.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute the compressible rings of Card with that disclosed in Levinson, in order to provide an alternative material for the rings.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Card in view of Monnet.

Monnet discloses the use of a lid having an aperture for the passage of a plunger element which is attached to a filter membrane 5.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the vessel of Card with the lid disclosed in Monnet, in order to prevent liquid from spilling from the vessel.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,416

Art Unit: 1761

Page 4

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-20 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald L. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reginald L. Alexander

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1761

rla

16 October 2006